

For purposes of comparison, there are also a few twentieth-century standard editions of the *Regulæ*, namely (in chronological order):²²⁴

- 1 *Regulæ ad directionem ingenii*, in: *Œuvres de Descartes*, vol. X, pp. 359–469, edited by Charles Adam and Paul Tannery (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin and Le Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1908 ff.). This traditional Latin version, referred to as ‘AT’, is based on ‘A’ but occasionally checked and balanced by ‘H’. For a variety of reasons Adam regarded ‘A’ as ‘bien préférable’ to ‘H’.²²⁵ The edition of Adam and Tannery represents a pioneering effort that contains mistakes, and it has been superseded by that of Crapulli. For example, Adam already knew of ‘N’,²²⁶ but he thought that ‘sans doute’ the same copy had served as its basis as would later do so for ‘A’.²²⁷ But, as Crapulli’s bilingual edition – with its juxtaposition of the Latin original and of the Dutch translation – indicates, this may not have been the case after all.
- 2 *Regulæ ad directionem ingenii: Texte critique établi ... avec la version hollandaise du XVIIème siècle*, in: *Archives internationales d’histoire des idées / International Archives of the History of Ideas*, vol. 12, by Giovanni Crapulli (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1965/1966). This comprehensive bilingual Latin-Dutch version, referred to as ‘C’, is based on ‘H’, ‘L’, ‘N’, ‘A’, and ‘AT’.²²⁸ It is arguably the only genuinely critical edition, and, in any case, it remains the most philologically justified one.²²⁹ The decisive difference between this edition and that of Adam and Tannery is that Adam, who was responsible for the latter, neglected ‘N’.²³⁰ Also, Crapulli prefers ‘H’ over ‘A’ in many more cases than did Adam. Remarkably, beyond recognizing that Descartes did make use of preexistent fragments and notes when bestowing a de facto final form on the text, Crapulli is extraordinarily careful not to get involved in the inextricable issues surrounding the irretrievably sedimented origins of the *Regulæ*.²³¹
- 3 *Regulæ ad directionem ingenii / Regeln zur Ausrichtung der Erkenntniskraft: Kritisch revidiert, übersetzt und herausgegeben*, in: *Philosophische Bibliothek*, vol. 262 a, by Heinrich Springmeyer, Lüder Gäbe, and Hans Günter Zekl (Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1973). This careful bilingual Latin-German version, referred to as ‘SGZ’, is based on ‘H’, ‘L’, ‘N’, ‘A’, ‘AT’, and ‘C’ – with a strong preference for following ‘H’ over both ‘N’ and ‘A’ as far as possible. For the basic intuition of this edition is that ‘H’ is closer to Descartes’ original because it has been subjected to less editorial revision than has ‘N’ or

²²⁴ Between the Blaeu edition of 1701 and the Adam and Tannery edition of 1908 French scholars produced the following: (1) Victor Cousin (trans.), *Règles pour la direction de l’esprit, Œuvres de Descartes*, ed. Victor Cousin, vol. 11 (Paris, 1826), pp. 199–329; (2) Adolphe Garnier (ed.), *Regulæ ad directionem ingenii, Œuvres philosophiques de Descartes*, vol. 3 (Paris, 1835), pp. 55–137; and (3) L. Aimé-Martin (ed.), *Règles pour la direction de l’esprit, Œuvres philosophiques de Descartes* (Paris, 1838), pp. 475–510. All use the Amsterdam edition as the sole source, but Cousin and Garnier correct it in some instances. In addition, there was an edition by a German scholar: Artur Buchenau (ed.), *René Descartes’ ‘Regulæ ad directionem ingenii’* (Leipzig, 1907). Although Buchenau does not say that he examined ‘H’, his corrections of ‘A’ are consistent with it.

²²⁵ See AT, X, 357.

²²⁶ See *ibid.*, p. 351 ff.

²²⁷ See *ibid.*, p. 353.

²²⁸ See Crapulli, *Regulæ: Texte critique*, p. xx ff.

²²⁹ Cf., e.g., *ibid.*, pp. xiv–xvi (‘N’ and ‘A’) and xvi–xx (‘H’ [‘L’] and ‘AT’).

²³⁰ See *ibid.*, p. xix.

²³¹ See *ibid.*, p. xxi: ‘Descartes a-t-il rédigé plusieurs fois le traité des *Regulæ*? Ni l’examen des variantes, ni la forme du traité ne permettent de répondre affirmativement à cette question. Les variantes en effet peuvent toutes s’expliquer par des phénomènes ordinaires de transcription ou d’adaptation dans le cas de passages défectueux ou douteux. D’autre part la nature “syllogique” du traité exclut, autant que son inachèvement, l’hypothèse d’une autre rédaction: l’auteur en effet semble avoir utilisé des fragments et des notes d’époques antérieures sans aboutir à une élaboration accomplie et unitaire.’